Contents

Chapter 5. Consultation and Coordination — 749	
Organizations and Agencies Consulted	.749
Tribal Consultations	
Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer	.750
Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument	.750
Core Team — Hualapai Tribe, Lake Mead National Recreational Area, and Grand Canyo	on
National Park	.750
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
NPS Interdisciplinary Team	
Public Input to the Planning Process	.751
Public Meetings	
Review and Evaluation of Public Comments	
Stakeholder Workshops and Expert Panel Meetings	.753
Plan Webpage	
List of Agencies, Organizations, Businesses, and Individuals Who Received the Draft Plan	
List of Preparers and Contributors	.759
Preparers	
Contributors (Sorted by Affiliation)	
Tables	
Table 5-1: American Indian Tribes Consulted	749
Table 5-2: Interdisciplinary Team Members	755

[This page intentionally blank so page 749 will be a right-hand page.]

CHAPTER 5. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

This section describes the consultation and coordination that have occurred during the preparation of this document. Consultation, coordination, and public involvement have been integral to identifying relevant issues and concerns and to make sure these issues are addressed. This was accomplished primarily through public meetings and workshops, informal meetings, individual contacts, website updates, news releases, and *Federal Register* notices.

ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

During the NEPA decision-making processes, the National Park Service is required to consult with certain American Indian tribes, as well as with federal and state agencies and entities because of jurisdictional responsibilities (40 CFR 1502.25). This section documents these consultation and coordination efforts. Consultation will be an ongoing effort through completion of a final document and agency decision.

TRIBAL CONSULTATIONS

In keeping with the provisions of National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act, the National Park Service established regular consultations with American Indian Tribes to address issues and concerns related to the current revisions of the *Colorado River Management Plan*. Table 5-1 lists the Tribal consultations that have occurred during the development of this document.

TABLE 5-1: AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBES CONSULTED

Tribal Nation	Nature of Consultations
Havasupai Tribe	Postal updates, personal contacts with the cultural resource representative, and a meeting with the tribal representative.
Hopi Tribe	Postal updates, personal contacts with the cultural resource representative, and a meeting with the tribal representatives.
Pueblo of Zuni	Postal updates and personal contacts with the cultural resource representative.
White Mountain Apache Tribe	Postal updates and personal contacts with the cultural resource representative.
Southern Paiute Consortium	Postal updates, personal contacts with the cultural resource representative, and a meeting with the tribal representatives.
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe	Invitation to enter into consultation.
Navajo Nation	Postal updates, personal contacts with the cultural resource and tribal representatives, and meetings with the Bodaway/Gap Chapter members and Navajo Nation representatives.
Hualapai Tribe	Cooperating agency. Frequent consultations, both in meetings and personal contacts via telephone and e-mail, included development of alternatives, impact identification, and review of administrative drafts.

Issues identified during tribal consultations included the following:

- The canyon needs an opportunity to "rest" during the off-season.
- Trespass and nonpayment of fees for access onto tribal lands is a significant concern for the Navajo Nation, the Hualapai Tribe, and the Havasupai Tribe.

- Certain sites, such as Deer Creek, the Little Colorado River confluence, and various natural springs, have special significance to some tribes and should be managed to minimize inappropriate behavior, crowding, and resource degradation.
- River runners do not have a clear understanding of the spiritual, social, economic, and historic significance of the Colorado River to its affiliated tribes. This lack of knowledge is evident in the incidents of inappropriate behavior in the river corridor, including trespass, intentional damage to resources, and disregard of tribal laws and regulations. All tribes requested that visitor education be enhanced to address these issues.
- Some tribes requested the opportunity to obtain full-river commercial use permits.
- Some tribes expressed concern over being able to access important traditionally significant sites and requested that the park work to ensure such access.
- Several issues that were not related to the *Colorado River Management Plan* were identified. Park personnel committed to address these issues in the appropriate venues, such as the revisions of the *Backcountry Management Plan*.

ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

The 1966 National Historic Preservation Act, as amended in 1992, requires federal agencies to consult with the state historic preservation officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regarding undertakings that may affect historic properties. Consultation by the National Park Service with the state historic preservation officer has occurred informally during the development of this *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*. A formal consultation letter was sent in February 2004, and consultations are ongoing as of the release of this document.

GRAND CANYON-PARASHANT NATIONAL MONUMENT

As part of the Arizona Strip Interagency Planning process, the planning staff made monthly progress reports to Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument and Lake Mead National Recreation Area staff. The national monument staff was also consulted to develop alternatives and identify impacts for passenger exchanges at Whitmore.

CORE TEAM — HUALAPAI TRIBE, LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATIONAL AREA, AND GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

In 2000, Grand Canyon National Park, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, and the Hualapai Tribe initiated formal consultation to address management issues on the Colorado River. This resulted in a "Memorandum of Understanding" that recognized the Area of Cooperation as that portion of the Colorado River from approximately RM 165 (National Canyon) to the RM 277, the boundary between Grand Canyon and Lake Mead. The "Memorandum of Understanding" provided a process to develop mutually agreed upon operational and management protocols applicable within the Area of Cooperation. This process includes ongoing quarterly meetings of the Core Team, made up of the superintendents and deputy superintendents of Grand Canyon and Lake mead, as well as the chair and vice chair of the Hualapai Tribe. Core Team meetings

seek to cooperatively develop protocols and regulations for the use of the lower Grand Canyon from National Canyon to Lake Mead. Grand Canyon provided updates on the river management planning process and common issues as part this interagency process. Additionally, members of the CRMP subcommittee of the Core Team met regularly to address alternative development, data collection and synthesis, issue identification, impact analysis, and integration of comments into draft versions of the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*.

When the park re-initiated the planning process as required by the settlement agreement, the Hualapai Tribe requested and was granted cooperating agency status, and a cooperative agreement was signed by Grand Canyon Superintendent Joseph Alston and Hualapai Tribal Chairperson Louise Benson on May 14, 2003. In accordance with CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1501.6), lead agencies are to "use the environmental analysis and proposals of cooperating agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise, to the maximum extent possible." The Hualapai Tribe provided essential data on the affected environment and assisted in the development of alternatives and mitigation measures.

U. S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

In compliance with of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, formal consultation will be initiated following determination of a preferred alternative later in the NEPA process. Informal consultations, initiated in March 2004, resulted in the identification of nine threatened or endangered species (bald eagle, California condor, Mexican spotted owl, southwestern willow flycatcher, Yuma clapper rail, humpback chub, razorback sucker, Kanab ambersnail, and California brown pelican) and two candidate species for listing as threatened or endangered species (yellow-billed cuckoo and relict leopard frog).

NPS INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM

The NPS Interdisciplinary Team met frequently throughout the development of the Darft Environmental Impact Statement. Team members are listed in Table 5-2.

PUBLIC INPUT TO THE PLANNING PROCESS

On June 13, 2002, the National Park Service issued a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* to prepare an environmental impact statement for the Colorado River Management Plan. As stated in the notice, "The purpose of this EIS/CRMP is to update management guidelines for the Colorado River corridor through Grand Canyon National Park." This announcement began the public scoping process, and a notice to extend the public scoping period was printed in the *Federal Register* on September 23, 2002.

During the public scoping period, which extended from June 13 to November 1, 2002, the National Park Service sought public input to reaffirm previously identified agency and public issues and to identify any new public issues and concerns. Scoping is required for documents prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, including environmental impact statements, to determine the scope of the document —what will be covered and in what

detail. The scoping process must be open to the public; state, local, and tribal governments; and affected federal agencies. The objectives of scoping are:

- Involve as many interested parties as possible in the environmental review process.
- Provide clear, easily understood, factual information to potentially affected parties.
- Provide meaningful and timely opportunities for public input.
- Identify, consider, and evaluate significant issues raised by interested parties to assist in the preparation of the *Colorado River Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*.
- Identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues that are not significant.
- Consider public comments throughout the decision-making and review process.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

As part of the scoping process, Grand Canyon National Park retained the services of The Mary Orton Company to help organize and manage a series of public meetings. More than 1,000 people attended a total of seven such meetings, which were held on the dates and in the communities listed below.

August 1, 2002	Denver, Colorado
August 6, 2002	Sandy, Utah (suburb of Salt Lake City)
August 8, 2002	Flagstaff, Arizona
August 13, 2002	Las Vegas, Nevada
August 15, 2002	Mesa, Arizona (suburb of Phoenix)
September 30, 2002	Towson, Maryland (suburb of Baltimore)
October 2, 2002	Oakland, California

The meetings were structured as open houses. Information about the planning process was presented through posters, handouts, and a large map of the project area. NPS personnel were available to answer questions, and rooms were provided for facilitator-led discussion groups. Attendees were invited to write comments on flipchart tearsheets and the map, to provide comments orally to a court reporter, and to submit written comments. A form and a permit-related questionnaire were provided for that purpose. Comments made during the discussion groups were recorded by the facilitators on flip charts.

REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Written public comments were submitted to the planning team by e-mail, U.S. mail, and hand delivery, as well as at the open house meetings. Members of the planning team read through every submission, identified specific comments within each submission, and coded them according to criteria developed for the process. When the initial review process was completed, a total of 55,165 comments were identified within the 13,770 submissions. Organization and

analysis of the submissions were completed with the assistance of SWCA Environmental Consultants, a firm retained to help develop the environmental impact statement.

Additionally, previously identified agency and public issues were compiled from the "Summary of Public Comment" from the 1997 *Colorado River Management Plan* scoping process conducted in April 1998. These comments were included in the 2002 scoping process database.

Almost every major comment received in 1997 was reiterated in 2002, plus several more. Given the number of comments received, the variations in detail were substantial. While it was not possible to adequately summarize every specific suggestion offered by the public in this process, the major issues stood out and were consistent with those raised in 1997. Information about the 2002 scoping process was disseminated to the public through the park's *Colorado River Management Plan* Internet site, press releases, mailings, and public meetings. A summary table of comments is presented in appendix B, as well as on the website. The major issues raised in the 2002 scoping comments are as follows:

- Access and visitor services
- Motors and aircraft use
- Allocation and the noncommercial permit system
- Level of use/crowding, trip length, group size
- Resource protection, tribal issues, NPS regulations

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS AND EXPERT PANEL MEETINGS

Two stakeholder workshops were conducted during the development of the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement* and involved representatives from nine stakeholder groups, including private boaters, outfitters, wilderness coalition representatives, ecological concerns, researchers, educators, commercial customers, commercial river guides, and people with disabilities. All of the affiliated tribes were invited to participate in the workshops. None of the tribes chose to have representatives participate in the workshops, but some tribal representatives did attend as observers.

On June 24 and 25, 2003, the Mary Orton Company conducted two focused stakeholder workshops and an evening public workshop as part of the process to revise the *Colorado River Management Plan*. These workshops did not re-open the public scoping period, but assisted the CRMP planning team in clarifying issues for the draft impact statement. The goal of the workshops was to clarify areas of agreement and disagreement among stakeholders and the public on what the park should include in a full range of reasonable alternatives in the impact statement. There were two issues of concern:

- allocation of recreational use
- motor use on the river

In January 2003 the Mary Orton Company held two more workshops to enable stakeholders to give the park more detailed and in-depth information and to identify areas of consensus. The

purpose of the panels was to provide input from academics, researchers, practitioners and other stakeholders

- Expert Panel #1: Carrying Capacity, Seasonality, and Group Size
- Expert Panel #2: Allocation of Recreational Use Among User Groups
- Stakeholder Workshops #1: Spectrum of Recreational Services Offered to the Public
- Stakeholder Workshop #2: Private River Trip Permit Distribution System

PLAN WEBPAGE

The plan website <www.nps.gov/grca/crmp> has been a useful tool for disseminating information about the status of the plan to the public. Information available on the website includes:

- History and background information
- Plan progress update letters (current and archived)
- Soundings newsletters (current and archived)
- Press releases (current and archived)
- Frequently asked questions
- Photos and informational posters and handouts from 2002 public scoping meetings
- 2002 public scoping issue analysis
- "Summary of Public Comment" from 1997 scoping process
- The 1979 Colorado River Management Plan, the 1979 Colorado River Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement, and the 1989 Colorado River Management Plan
- Stakeholder workshop handouts and reports
- Recent use statistics, graphs, and reports
- January 2002 court settlement documents
- Guiding principles
- Federal Register documents
- National Park Service laws and policies

TABLE 5-2: INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM MEMBERS

ID Team Member	NPS Department
Michael Anderson	Cultural Resources, Science Center
William Allen	Trails, Maintenance and Engineering
Janet Balsom	Cultural Resources Branch Chief, Science Center
Jill Beshears	Environmental Compliance, Science Center
Carl Bowman	Natural Resources/Air Quality, Science Center
Mathieu Brown	Biological Technician, Science Center
David Chapman	Wilderness / Lees Ferry Ranger / Visitor and Resource Protection
Cole Crocker-Bedford	Natural Resources Branch Chief, Science Center
Jeffrey Cross	Project Manager, Science Center Director
Lori Crystal	Social Science / Recreation Planning, Science Center
David Desrosiers	Wilderness / River District, Visitor and Resource Protection
J. Grace Ellis	Cultural Resources / Archeology, Science Center
Rick Ernenwein	Lead Planner, Science Center
Jennifer Dierker	Cultural Resources / Archeology, Science Center
Jacob Fillion	Education, Interpretation
Mae Franklin	Cultural Resources / Tribal Liaison, Science Center
Lenore Grover-Bullington	Natural Resources / Planning, Science Center
Nick Hardig	Chief of Concessions
Kirsten Heins	Permits Program, Visitor and Resource Protection
Linda Jalbert	Social Science / Recreation / Wilderness Planning, Science Center
Mary Killeen	Special Assistant to the Superintendent
Allen Keske	Concessions Specialist, Concessions
Lisa Leap	Cultural Resources / Archeology, Science Center
Mark Lellouch	Socioeconomics / Special Assistant
Elaine Leslie	Natural Resources / Wildlife, Science Center
Lori Makarick	Natural Resources / Vegetation, Science Center
Leah McGinnis	Management Assistant, Superintendent's Office
Michael McGinnis	Wilderness / River District, Visitor and Resource Protection
Chris Mengel	Wilderness / River District, Visitor and Resource Protection
Maureen Oltrogge	Public Affairs, Superintendent's Office
John Rihs	Natural Resources / Earth Sciences, Science Center
Laura Shearin	Contracts, Concessions
Rachel Stanton	Environmental Protection Assistant, Maintenance
Steve Sullivan	Permits Program, Visitor and Resource Protection
R.V. Ward	Natural Resources / Wildlife, Science Center
Ken Weber	Social Science, Science Center
Sara White	Environmental Compliance

LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, BUSINESSES, AND INDIVIDUALS WHO RECEIVED THE DRAFT PLAN

There are over 1,500 entries on the mailing list for this plan with physical mailing addresses, and an additional 5,000 entries with e-mail addresses only. Compact disks (CDs) are being sent to all persons on the list with physical mailing addresses, and e-mail messages are being sent to all persons on the list with information about how to obtain a copy. In addition, the document is being posted on the Internet so that people can download document files from the park's Colorado River Management Plan website (http://www.nps.gov/grca/crmp). Copies are also being made available at the main library in the cities listed below. A complete list of individuals receiving copies of the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement* is on file at park headquarters.

The following is a partial list of the agencies, offices, and organizations to whom this document is being sent. As requests for copies are received during public review of this document, the list will be updated.

Federal Agencies

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Department of Agriculture

Coconino National Forest

Kaibab National Forest

Department of the Interior

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Bureau of Land Management

Arizona State

Arizona Strip

Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument

Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Vermillion Cliffs National Monument

Bureau of Reclamation

National Park Service

Arizona State Coordinator

Bryce Canyon National Park

Canyonlands National Park

Flagstaff Area Office

Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area

Intermountain Regional Office

Lake Mead National Recreation Area

Pipe Springs National Monument

Utah State Coordinator

Zion National Park

United States Fish and Wildlife Service

U. S. Geological Survey

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Arizona Congressional Delegation

Office of Senator John McCain

Office of Senator John Kyl

Office of Congressman Raul Grijalva

Office of Congressman J. D. Hayworth

Office of Congressman Jim Kolbe

Office of Congressman Ed Pastor

Office of Congressman Rick Renzi

Office of Congressman John Shadegg

Arizona State Agencies

Office of the Governor
State Historic Preservation Office
Department of Environmental Quality
Department of Transportation and Planning
Game and Fish Department

Indian Tribal Governments

Havasupai Tribe
Hopi Tribe
Hualapai Tribe
Navajo Nation
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
Pueblo of Zuni
White Mountain Apache Tribe

Regional, County, Local and City Governments

City of Flagstaff

City of Fredonia

City of Kanab

City of Las Vegas

City of Page

City of Phoenix

City of Williams

Coconino County Board of Supervisors

Organizations and Businesses

American Canoe Association

American Whitewater

Arizona Wilderness Coalition

Grand Canyon Association

Grand Canyon Field Institute

Grand Canyon National Park Foundation

Grand Canyon Private Boaters Association

Grand Canyon Resort Corporation

Grand Canyon River Guides

Grand Canyon River Operators Association

Grand Canyon Trust

Grand Canyon Wildlands Council

Hualapai River Runners

Living Rivers

National Parks Conservation Association

River of Dreams

River Runners for Wilderness

Sierra Club

Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance

Southwest Rivers

The Nature Conservancy

The Wilderness Society

River Concessioners

Arizona Raft Adventures, Inc.

Arizona River Runners, Inc.

Canyoneers, Inc.

Canyon Expeditions, Inc.

Colorado River & Trail Expeditions, Inc.

Diamond River Adventures, Inc.

Grand Canyon Discovery, Inc.

Grand Canyon Expeditions Company

Hatch River Expeditions, Inc.

Moki Mac River Expeditions, Inc.

OARS, Inc./Grand Canyon Dories, Inc.

Outdoors Unlimited River Trips

Tour West, Inc.

Western River Expeditions, Inc.

Wilderness River Adventures

Local Libraries

Denver, Colorado

Flagstaff, Arizona

Las Vegas, Nevada

Phoenix, Arizona

Salt Lake City, Utah

San Francisco, California

LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

The individuals who helped prepare this *Draft Environmental Impact Statement* or who contributed to its preparation are listed below.

PREPARERS

Name	Responsibility	Education	Years Experience
National Park Ser	rvice/Grand Canyon National Park		
Janet Balsom	Cultural Resources Branch Chief Science Center	B.A. Anthropology M.A. Anthropology	24
Carl Bowman	Natural Resources/Air Quality Science Center	GRCA Air Quality Specialist B.S. Biology	12
Jeffrey Cross	Project Manager Science Center Director	B.S. Zoology M.S. Zoology PhD. Fisheries Biology	31
Lori Crystal	Social Science/Recreation Planning Science Center	B.S. Leisure Studies & Resource Mgt. M.S. Resource Recreation & Tourism	18
David Desrosiers	River Ranger		
J. Grace Ellis	Cultural Resources, Archeology Science Center	BA Anthropology	14
Rick Ernenwein	Planning Team Leader Science Center	B.S. Renewable Natural Resources	25
Lenore Grover- Bullington	Natural Resources/Planning Science Center	B.S. Biology M.S. Forestry	19
Linda Jalbert	Social Science/Recreation/ Wilderness Planning, Science Center	B.S. Recreation	16
Mark Lellouch	Business Planner	B.S. Mathematics-Computer Science, Brown University M.S. Computer Science, Harvard University M.B.A., Stanford Graduate School of Business	13
Elaine Leslie	Natural Resources/Wildlife Science Center	B.S. Wildlife Biology/Environmental Science M.S. Environmental Science	29
Lori Makarick	Natural Resources/Vegetation Science Center	B.A. Conservation Biology M.S. Restoration Ecology	11
John Rihs	Natural Resources/Earth Sciences Science Center	B.S. Geology, M.S. Environmental Systems Applied Geology	13
Joe Shannon	Aquatic Resources	B.A. Marine Biology M.S. Aquatic Biology Ph.D. Aquatic Biology	24
Steve Sullivan	Permits Program Visitor & Resource Protection	M.S. Environmental Education B.A. Liberal Arts	11
Ken Weber	Social Science Science Center	B.A. Social Science M.A. Cultural Anthropology M.B.A. Organizational Management	32

CONTRIBUTORS (SORTED BY AFFILIATION)

Name	Responsibility	Education	Years Experience
National Park Se	rvice / Grand Canyon National Park	•	· -
Mathieu Brown	Biological Technician Science Center	B.S. Business Administration B.A. Liberal Studies/Natural	4
	Odence Center	Resources	
David Chapman	Wilderness / Lees Ferry Ranger / Visitor and Resource Protection	B.S.E. Recreation Education	19
Laurie Domler	NEPA/106 Specialist	B.A. Planning M.S. Natural Resource Studies	17
Jacob Fillion	Environmental Education Branch Chief	B.A. Latin American Studies M.A. Education	20
Nick Hardigg	Chief of Concessions	B.A. Environmental Science M.S. Business Administration	15
Kirsten Heins	Permits Program Visitor and Resource Protection	B.S. Forest Recreation Resources	5
Mary Killeen	Planning Team Assistant Superintendent's Office	B.A. Political Science	25
Leah McGinnis	Acting Management Assistant, Superintendent's Office	B.A. Business Administration	13
Michael McGinnis	Wilderness/River District Visitor and Resource Protection	B.S. Outdoor Recreation Management	18
Ken McMullen	Overflights and Natural Sounds Program Manager	B.S. Range and Wildlands Science MS Range Science	22
Chris Mengel	Wilderness/River District Visitor & Resource Protection	A.S.B.S. Biology	15
Diana Pennington	Filming Permits Coordinator Superintendent's Office	B.S. Natural Resources	11
Bob Rossman	NPS Natural Sounds Program Washington Office	B.S. Watershed Science and Hydrology	24
Laura Shearin	Concessions Management	B.A. Economics / Accounting, Music B.S. Math Education	8
Karen Trevino	Chief, NPS Natural Sounds Program, Washington Office	B.S. Communications / Political Science J.D. (Environmental Law emphasis)	15
Christine L. Turk	Regional Environmental Quality Coordinator, Intermountain Region	B.A. Biological Sciences	31
R.V. Ward	Natural Resources/Wildlife Science Center	B.S. Zoology M.S. Wildlife Ecology J.D. (Natural Resources Law)	35
	ental Consultants*		
Mike Boyle	Deputy Project Manager — NEPA	B.S. Marketing B.S. Geography	20
Erin Cole	Hydrologist	B.S. Geology M.S. Geoscience	13
Lisa Dickerson	Administrative Record		6
Karen Epperly	Administrative Record		9
Gary Galbraith	Biologist	B.S. Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences	18

_

^{*} SWCA Environmental Consultants, Inc., and their team of subcontractors listed below were preparers during the early stages of the planning process from September 2002 through March 2004, including preparation of early drafts of this environmental impact statement. However, the SWCA team has not been involved with changes to the draft document since that time.

			Years
Name	Responsibility	Education	Experience
Glen Hanson	NEPA Specialist	B.S. Anthropology	28
		M.A. Anthropology	
Jim Hasbargen	Archaeologist	B.S. Biology	8
		M.S. Quaternary Sciences	
		M.A. Anthropology	
Dorothy House	Editor, Writer, NEPA Specialist	B.A. Social Sciences	30
•		M.A. Librarianship	
Kim Hutson	Water Quality Specialist, Planner	B.A. Planning	10
		M.S. Water Resources Management	
Ashley Jenkins	GIS Technician	GIS Certificate	4
Matt Lauretta	Biologist	B.S. Environmental Science	3
Bill Leibfried	Aquatic Biologist	B.S. Biological Sciences	22
		M.S. Ecology	
Ken MacDonald	Project Manager - NEPA	B.A. Biological Sciences	15
	, ,	M.B.A. Business Administration	
Jessica Maggio	Administrative Assistant	B.A. Anthropology	2
Michael O'Hara	Archaeologist	B.A. American Studies	16
	, monaconognos	M.A. Library and Information Science	. •
		M.A. Anthropology	
Donna Osborne	Administrative/Editor	a r anam op ology	22
Gordon Rakita	Statistics and Data Management	B.A. Anthropology	10
Cordon Rakita	Ctatistics and Data Management	M.A. Anthropology	10
		Ph.D. Anthropology	
Suzanne	Botanist	B.S. Botany	5
Rhodes	Dotariist	B.G. Botarry	3
John Thomas	NEPA Specialist	B.S. Natural Resource Management	15
Leslie Wagner	Biologist	B.S. Wildlife Biology	2
	cience Associates	B.S. Wilding Biology	
Nancy Barbic	NEPA / DO 12 Specialist	B.S. Plant Ecology	12
Nicholas	Economics	M.P.P Public Policy	12
Carlson	Economics	M.A. Philosophy, Politics, and	12
Callson		Economics	
Brown-Buntin A	secciatos	Economics	
Bob Brown	Soundscape	B.A. Biological Sciences	32
Montgomery Wa		B.A. Biological Sciences	32
Danny Kringle		B.A. Mathematics	26
URS Corporation	Air Quality	b.A. Mathematics	26
		D.A. latawastianal Affaira	00
Greg Sorensen	Editor	B.A. International Affairs	29
Independent Co			10
Lynn Neal,	Archaeologist	B.A. Archaeology and Geology	13
EnviroSystems		M.A. Anthropology	
Management,			
Inc.	Divor Degraphics On set 11 t	D.A. Casiala Davida	00
Bo Shelby,	River Recreation Specialist	B.A. Sociology, Psychology, and	28
Confluence		Literature	
Research		M.A. Sociology	
Consultants	Divor Degraphics On set 11 t	Ph.D. Sociology	40
Doug Whittaker,	River Recreation Specialist	B.A. Geography	16
Confluence		M.S. Forest Management	
Research		Ph.D. Human Dimensions in Natural	
Consultants		Resources	
Northern Arizon	1	D.O. F	^
Evan Hjerpe	Economics	B.S. Economics	3
V 0 10	 	M.S. Forestry Economics	40
Yeon-Su Kim	Economics	B.S. Forestry	12
		M.S. Forest Resources	
		Ph.D. Forest Resources	

Name	Responsibility	Education	Years Experience
Hualapai Tribe	-		
Don Bay	Director Hualapai Department of Natural Resources	B.S. Wildlife	26
Steve Beattie	Grand Canyon Resort Corporation	B.S. Business	5
Clay Bravo	Assistant Director Hualapai Department of Natural Resources		25
Alex Cabillo III	Water Resource Program Manager	B.A. Psychology	11
Dr. Kerry Christensen	Senior Scientist	B.S., M.S. PhD Zoology	24
Jack Earhardt	Tribal Planner		30
Cisney Havatone	Air Program Manager	B.S. Elementary Education	9
Waylon Honga	Grand Canyon Resort Corporation	B.S. Business	10
Loretta Jackson	Tribal Historic Preservation Officer		13
Annette Morgan	Wildlife Fisheries and Parks Program Manager	B.S. Environmental Biology M.S. Fisheries	7
Dave Wegner	EMI Consultant	B.S., M.S. Aquatic Ecology and Engineering	25